1	James Alan Bush 1745 De Marietta Avenue #3	
2	San Jose, CA 95126 (408) 982-3272	FILED
3	Plaintiff in pro per	2000 APR 28 A 9 29
4	<u> </u>	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK
5		U.S. DISTRICT COURT NO. DIST OF CAS.
6		
7		•
8	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SAN JO	OSE DIVISION
11		
12		
13	James Alan Bush,) Case No.: C 08-01354 (RS) JF
14	Plaintiff,) MORION FOR INTUNGRITUR AND MONTH DA
15	v.) MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY) RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANT KATHY
16	United States Attorney General, et al.,) BICKEL ON PETITION AND OTHER) PAPERS WITHOUT EVIDENTIARY HEARING) OR ORAL ARGUMENT
17	Defendants.))
18) Judge Jeremy Fogel
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

Plaintiff, James Alan Bush, and petitioner in the above-titled cause, moves the court, in connection with the complaint filed on March 10th, 2008, in this matter, to consider the petitioner's request for mandatory injunctive relief and the award of damages based on the memoranda, affidavit, and exhibits of the petitioner without evidentiary hearing, and without oral argument, unless such is desired by the court. Petitioner respectfully urges the court to set a date for respondent to file her answer. The court is urged to set a further date later for respondent to file her affidavits and memorandum, with a subsequent date for petitioner to file, if necessary, a reply memorandum.

In suppport of this motion, petitioner submits the following:

- 1. The matters involved are subject to prompt consideration by the court.
- 2. The court must only satisfy itself that the petitioner has reasonable cause to believe that the property he lawfully possesses has been unlawfully converted for the use of the respondent.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This is a petition by Plaintiff, James Alan Bush, against,

Defendant, Kathy Bickel, for conversion of property, and seeks to

recover damages, pursuant to Civ. Code §§ 3336-3338, and to recover

the reasonable value of the property converted, pursuant to Civ. Code

§ 3336; or, in the alternative, to recover the property itself, pursuant

to Civ. Code § 3379; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 511.010-516.050 (claim and

delivery).

Defendant Bickel is required to return wrongfully acquired property, even in the absence of any demand made by the owner for the return of wrongfully acquired property, pursuant to Civ. Code §§ 1712 and 1713.

4

5

1

2

3

MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY RELIEF

Plaintiff complains and for this cause of action for conversion of

6

7

property alleges as follows:

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

 Plaintiff was a resident of the City of Sunnyvale, County of Santa Clara, State of California, residing at 1220 Tasman Drive SPC #379; and, Plaintiff now is a resident of the City of San Jose, County of

Santa Clara, State of California, residing at 1745 De Marietta Avenue

Apartment #3.

- Defendant, Kathy Bickel, now is, and at all times relevant to this action was, a resident of the City of Greenwood, County of Johnson, State of Indiana, residing at 1256 Blakely Drive.
- 3. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff was, and still is, entitled to the possession of the following property:
 - Apple Powermac G4 (Part Number M8841LL/A) (Serial Number XB3110ARN1Y)
 - The purchase receipt is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.
 - 1 GB DDR 333 PC2700 SO-DIMM (Part Number M9594G/A)

 The purchase receipt is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.
 - DVDs, containing audio recordings and electronic documents intended to be submitted as evidence in a pending civil matter

- A hand-held digital recorder, which contained audio recordings
 intended to be submitted as evidence in a pending civil matter
 - 4. On or about August 15th, 2006, the above-mentioned property had a combined value of \$3,500.
 - 5. On or about August 15th, 2006, Defendant Bickel took the abovementioned property from Plaintiff's possession and converted the same to her own use.
 - 6. On or about October 15th, 2006, Plaintiff demanded the immediate return of the above-mentioned property; but, Defendant Bickel failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to return the property to Plaintiff.
 - 7. Between the time of Defendant's conversion of the above-mentioned property to his own use and the filing of this action, Plaintiff expended the following time and money in pursuit of the converted property, all to Plaintiff's further damage in the sum of \$1,500.
 - 8. Defendant's act of failing to return personal property of Plaintiff is an act of willful interference with that property, done without lawful justification, by which Plaintiff, the person entitled to the property, is deprived of its use and possession, and constitutes an act of conversion.
 - 8. The aforementioned act of the Defendant was willful, wanton, malicious, and oppressive, was undertaken with the intent to retaliate with the exercise of Plaintiff's legal right to file a lawsuit against her for the acts alleged therein, and justify the awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in the amount of \$5,000.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against the Defendant, as follows:

- An injunction ordering the return of the property described herein, pursuant to Civ. Code § 3379 and Code Civ. Proc. §§ 511.010-516.050;
- For the value of the property converted in the sum of \$3,399;
- For interest at the legal rate on the foregoing sum pursuant to Civ. Code § 3336, from and after August 15th, 2006;
- For damages for time and money properly expended in pursuit of the converted property in the sum of \$1,500;
- For punitive and exemplary damages in the sum of \$5,000; and,
- For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper, including damages for the proximate and foreseeable loss resulting from Defendant's conversion.

VERIFICATION

I, James Alan Bush, Plaintiff in the above-entitled action, have read the foregoing and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters that are therein alleged on information and belief; and, as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed at San Jose, California.

Petitioner:

Dated: 4

PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING INJUNCTION The motion of plaintiff, James Alan Bush, for injunctive relief

and the award of damages was heard before the undersigned judge on [date], pursuant to a duly noticed motion filed by the plaintiff on April 25th, 2008. The court having considered the documentary evidence introduced by the plaintiff, and it appearing to this court that great or irreparable injury will be suffered unless such an order be issued.

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant, Kathy Bickel, do the following:

- Return the property described herein, pursuant to Civ. Code § 3379 and Code Civ. Proc. §§ 511.010-516.050; or,
- Pay to the plaintiff the value of the property converted in the sum of \$3,500; and,
- Pay to the plaintiff for interest at the legal rate on the foregoing sum pursuant to Civ. Code § 3336, from and after August 15th, 2006;
- Pay to the plaintiff for damages for time and money properly expended in pursuit of the converted property in the sum of \$1,500; and,
- Pay to the plaintiff for punitive and exemplary damages in the sum of \$5,000.

Judge: _____ Dated: _____ Clerk: ____

• •

MOTION

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2	James Alan Bush 1745 De Marietta Avenue #3 San Jose, CA 95126					
3	(408) 982–3272					
4	Plaintiff in pro per					
5						
7						
8	INTER STATES DISTRICT COIDT					
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION					
11						
12						
13	James Alan Bush,) Case No.: C 08-01354 (RS) JF					
14	Plaintiff,) PETITIONER'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS					
15	v.) AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF) MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY					
16	United States Attorney General,) RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANT KATHY et al.,) BICKEL					
17	Defendants.)					
18) Judge Jeremy Fogel					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						

RELEVANT STATUTORY SCHEME

- Conversion of property is governed under California law as follows:
- Civ. Code §§ 3336-3338 governs damages recoverable for conversion of property.
- Code Civ. Proc. § 338(c) governs the time period in which action for conversion must be brought.
- Civ. Code §§ 1712 and 1713 set forth the requirement that a person return wrongfully acquired property and provide that the owner need not make any demand for the return of wrongfully acquired property in order to bring an action for conversion.
- Civ. Code § 3379 and Code Civ. Proc. §§ 511.010-516.050 entitles

 Plaintiff to bring an action for claim and delivery to recover the property itself.

CASE LAW

- 1. DEFENDANT'S ACT OF FAILING TO RETURN PERSONAL PROPERTY OF PLAINTIFF

 IS AN ACT OF WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH THAT PROPERTY, DONE WITHOUT

 LAWFUL JUSTIFICATION, BY WHICH PLAINTIFF, THE PERSON ENTITLED TO THE

 PROPERTY, IS DEPRIVED OF ITS USE AND POSSESSION, AND CONSTITUTES AN

 ACT OF CONVERSION.
 - A. Conversion Defined. Conversion is any act of willful interference with the personal property of another, or any act of dominion exerted over another's personal property, done without legal justification, depriving that person entitled to the property of its use and possession (see de Vries v. Brumback (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 643, 647, 2 Cal. Rptr. 764, 349, P.2d 532; Weiss v. Marcus

MEMORANDA

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

- (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 590, 599, 124 Cal. Rptr. 297).
- B. Necessary Allegations. In order to state a cause of action for conversion, the plaintiff must allege first, his or her ownership or right to possession of tangible property at the time of the conversion; second, the defendant's conversion of the property; and, third, damages (Franklin v. Municipal Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 884, 902, 103 Cal. Rptr. 354).
- C. General Allegations of Wrongful Conversion Sufficient. A general allegation that defendant converted property to his or her own use is sufficient to state a good cause of action in the absence of a demurrer for uncertainty (see Haigler v. Donnelly (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 674, 681, 117 P.2d 331; Lowe v. Ozmun (1902) 137 Cal. 257, 260, 70 P. 87; Franklin v. Municipal Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 884, 902, 103 Cal. Rptr. 354).
- PROPERTY CONVERTED BY DEFENDANT WAS THE PERSONAL PROPERTY OF PLAINTIFF CONSISTING OF ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT VALUED AT \$3,399 AND THEREFORE WAS PROPERTY SUBJECT TO CONVERSION.
 - A. Personal Property, Tangible or Intangible, Can Be Subject to Conversion. Every species of personal property, both tangible and intangible and capable of being identified, can be subject to conversion (Payne v. Elliot (1880) 54 Cal. 339, 340-342).
- 3. PLAINTIFF IS OWNER AND HAS RIGHT TO IMMEDIATE POSSESSION OF THE PROPERTY CONVERTED AND THEREFORE HAS SUFFICIENT INTEREST IN THE PROPERTY TO MAINTAIN AN ACTION FOR CONVERSION.
 - A. Plaintiff Owned or Had Right to Immediate Possession of Property Converted. In order to state a cause of action for conversion,

the plaintiff must allege his or her ownership or right to possession of the property in question at the time of the alleged conversion (Franklin v. Municipal Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 884, 902, 103 Cal. Rptr. 354).

- B. Plaintiff With Right to Immediate Possession Need Not Be in Actual Possession at Time of Conversion. A plaintiff who has the right to immediate possession of the property at the time of the alleged conversion need not be in actual possession of the property at the time to maintain an action for conversion (see Franklin v. Municipal Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 884, 901-902, 103 Cal. Rptr. 354).
- 3. THE PROPER MEASURE OF DAMAGES IN AN ACTION FOR CONVERSION OF

 PERSONAL PROPERTY IS THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY AT THE TIME OF THE

 CONVERSION, PLUS INTEREST FROM THE TIME OF CONVERSION, OR AN AMOUNT

 SUFFICIENT TO INDEMNIFY PLAINTIFF FOR THE NATURAL, REASONABLE,

 AND PROXIMATE RESULT OF THE WRONGFUL ACT COMPLAINED OF, AND WHICH

 A PROPER DEGREE OF PRUDENCE ON HIS OR HER PART WOULD NOT HAVE

 AVERTED.
 - A. Measure of Damages for Conversion. The detriment caused by the wrongful conversion of personal property is presumed to be the value of the property at the time of the conversion, plus interest from the time of conversion, or an amount sufficient to indemnify the party for the natural, reasonable, and proximate result of the wrongful act complained of, and which a proper degree of prudence on his or her part would not have averted (see Civ. Code § 3336).

2 | 3 4 |

- B. Cost of Property as Proof of Value. Cost of goods is a circumstance tending to show value, and that evidence may be taken into consideration, along with other circumstances, when determining the subsequent value of property converted in order to establish the loss sustained (Wade v. Markwell & Co. (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 410, 431-432, 258 P.2d 497).
- C. Prejudgment Interest Available. If the measure of damages is an amount sufficient to indemnify the party for the loss suffered, prejudgment interest may be awarded pursuant to the general prejudgment interest authority of Civ. Code § 3287(a) (Moreno v. Greenwood Auto Ctr. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 201, 210-211, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177).
- 4. PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO AN AWARD OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES
 ARISING OUT OF DEFENDANT'S CONVERSION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.
 - A. Emotional Distress Damages Recoverable. A plaintiff is entitled to recover emotional distress damages growing out of a defendant's conversion of his or her personal property (Gonzales v. Personal Storage, Inc. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 464, 477, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473).

ARGUMENTS

1. AN INJUNCTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS SHOULD ISSUE BECAUSE IT IS LIEKLY

THAT PLAINTIFF WILL PREVAIL ON THE MERITS OF HIS CLAIM.

In order to qualify for an injunction, the plaintiff must

demonstrate that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his

lawsuit and that he is likely to suffer greater harm from a

2.

failure to issue the injunction than the harm that would befall the defendant if the injunction is issued [O'Connell v. Superior Court (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1452, 1467-1468, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 147; Teamsters Local 856 v. Priceless, LLC (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1500, 1509-1510, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 847; White v. Davis (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 969, 981, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 51]. Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of his action because the defendant's action clearly violates California Penal Code §

484(a). Moreover, it is inconceivable that the defendant could articulate any legally justifiable excuse for her actions. Since plaintiff will surely succeed on his claim of a violation of California Penal Code § 484(a), he is likely to succeed on his Civ. Code § 3336 cause of action.

AN INJUNCTION IS NECESSARY TO PREVENT CONTINUING AND IRREPARABLE INJURY TO PLAINTIFF AND THE BALANCE OF HARDSHIPS FAVORS PLAINTIFF. The continuing harm to the plaintiff, if an injunction does not issue, is irreparable, in that he will continue to be deprived of the use of his property. An injunction may be granted when it appears by the verified petition and affidavits that the continuance of some act during the litigation would produce irreparable injury to a party in the action [Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2)]. An order granting an injunction is not fatally flawed because it contains no explicit finding that the injunction is necessary to prevent irreparable injury [Conover v. Hall (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 842, 850, 114 Cal. Rptr. 642, 523 P. 2d 682].

Under the "irreparable injury" standard, an injunction may issue

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

to prevent wrongs of repeated and continuing character ones that cause damages estimable only by conjecture and not by any accurate standard [Huong Que, Inc. v. Luu, 150 Cal. App. 4th 400, 417-418, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527; People ex rel. Gow v. Mitchell Brothers' Santa Ana Theater (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 863, 870-871, 173 Cal. Rptr. 476; Wind v. Herbert (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 276, 285, 8 Cal. Rptr. 817]. By comparison, no harm will befall the defendant as a result of the proposed injunction. Thus, the balance of any hardships to be considered weighs substantially in favor of the plaintiff and the issuance of an injunction.

3. AN INJUNCTION IS NECESSARY TO AVOID MULTIPLICITY OF SUITS.

An injunction will issue when necessary to prevent a multiplicity of judicial proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(6)]; particulary, in cases in which many claims that have not been adjudicated have been brought into equity to be the subject of a single trial and decree [Verdier v. Verdier (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 724, 735, 22 Cal. Rptr. 93].

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the motion of the plaintiff for a mandatory injunction compelling the surrender of Plaintiff's property, which he lawfully possess, against the defendant should be granted.

Petitioner:

25

Dated:

C 08-01354 (RS) JF

```
James Alan Bush
1
      1745 De Marietta Avenue #3
2
      San Jose, CA 95126
      (408) 982-3272
3
      Plaintiff in pro per
4
5
6
7
                             UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
                            NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9
                                   SAN JOSE DIVISION
10
11
12
                                           ) Case No.: C 08-01354 (RS) JF
      James Alan Bush,
13
                            Plaintiff,
14
                                           ) AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
                                             INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY RELIEF
15
       . V.
                                              AGAINST DEFENDANT KATHY BICKEL
      United States Attorney General,
16
       et al.,
                                              Judge Jeremy Fogel
17
                           Defendants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

1	AFFIDAVIT				
2	I, Long Thang Cao, being first duly sworn, deposes and declare as				
3	follows:				
4	1. I make this declaration in support of motion for injunctive and				
5	monetary relief made by Plaintiff, James Alan Bush, against				
6	Defendant, Kathy Bickel.				
7	2. The facts and allegations made in the aforementioned motion are a				
8	matter of my personal knowledge. I would be competent to testify to				
9	their truth if I were called as a witness.				
LO					
1	Signed: Dated:				
12					
13	JURAT				
14	State of California				
Į.	1				
15	County of				
İ	County of				
16	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on				
16 17					
16 17 18	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on				
16 17 18 19	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of				
16 17 18 19	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by				
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of				
16 17 18 19 20 21	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of				
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of				
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this day of, 20, by personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of				

1	James Alan Bush 1745 De Marietta Avenue #3				
2	San Jose, CA 95126 (408) 982-3272				
3	Plaintiff in pro per				
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
11					
12					
13	James Alan Bush,)	Case No.: C 08-01354 (RS) JF			
14	Plaintiff,)	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN			
.15	v.)	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S PETITION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND MONETARY RELIEF			
16	United States Attorney General,) et al.,	AGAINST DEFENDANT KATHY BICKEL			
17	Defendants.)	Judge Jeremy Fogel			
18)				
19					
20					
21	Plaintiff hereby requests the Court take Judicial Notice pursuant to				
22	Federal Rule of Evidence 201 of the following exhibits:				
23	1. Exhibit "A", Purchase Receipt for	r Apple Powermac G4 minitower; and,			
24	2. Exhibit "B", Purchase Receipt fo	r 1 GB RAM SO-DIMM.			
25		// 0			
26	Signed:	Dated: 4-25-08			
	JUDICIAL NOTICE PAG	C 08-01354 (RS) JF			

EXHIBIT A

Purchase Receipt for Apple Powermac G4 minitower

Receipt

PLEASE RETAIN THIS DOCUMENT FOR YOUR RECORDS.

DATE:

March 22, 2003

CUSTOMER: ADDRESS: PHONE: E-MAIL:

RECEIPT ID:

- Part Number M8841LL/A - Senal Number XB3110ARNIY

Mar. 21, 2004



Valley Fair 2855 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 1025 Santa Clara, CA 95050 408 551-2150 valleyfair@apple.com

TOTAL

http://store.apple.com/valleyfair

UNIT PRICE



h	Apr. 01, 2003 \$269.90 fee if opened	FOR SUPPORT, VISIT APPLE.COM/SUPPORT	1	\$2,699.00	\$2,699.00
				Sub-Total Tax @8.25% Total	\$2,699.00 \$222.67 \$2,921.67
	Payment Method:	Visa (A)	5782	051398	\$2,921.67
				Total Tender	\$2,921.67
				Change Due	\$0.00

Page 1 of 1

Furthers Princes If you are not satisfied with your Apple purchase, please returns with the original accepts and all originat probating within ten [10] related in the form of purchase. If the form is returned, unquested, in the original beautiful based or now original method of powers in Earthers within ten (10) hours so that for an Apple Instant Linas will be returned in the form of a credit to your account. Apple will mad a check within ten (10) hours so that for cach, cach a country of the form of a credit to your account. Apple will mad a check within ten (10) hours so that for cach a country of the form of a credit to your account. Apple will mad a check within ten (10) hours so that for cach a country of the form of a credit to your account and the country of the check transportion or credit to a credit to your account and the check transport of the check transport of the check transport of the check transport or credit to the country of the check transport of the check transport or credit to the country of the check transport of the check transport or credit to the check transport of the check transport or credit to your access of the check transport or credit to the country of the check transport of the check transport or credit to your access the check and the check with the country of the check transport of the check and the check transport of the check and the check an

*Non-tipple intended products are selected apple "AND". Beaute consult appropriate manufactures for unformation on sents and conditions of warranty. The AppleCare Protection Plan is a service customs and the explication date shown as the explication date for this coverage. Quoted and TM Apple Conspirer, Inc. All rights reserved.

EXHIBIT B

Purchase Receipt for 1 GB RAM SO-DIMM

